REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are currently in the application as acted upon by the Office Action. Claims 1-20 stand rejected and no claims are allowed. By this response claims 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13, 15, 18 and 19 are presently amended. The present response cancels claims 1, 8-10, 14, 16, 17 and 20, with the proviso that the cancellations are to be without prejudice.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 11, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinate for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner stated the use of the term "unlike presentation display" found in the claims has multiple possible meanings, and is not clarified by supportive language in the claim or specification. The claims are thus subjected to the broadest reasonable interpretation by the Examiner. As a result, claims depending on the above rejected claims stand rejected.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-10 and 13-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookspan et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888) and "Network Time Protocol (NTP) General Overview" by David L. Mills, hereinafter Mills.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Outlook to schedule and synchronize presentation broadcasts across a network. Outlook must be installed on every computer on the network in order for a user to receive messages about the presentation (see col. 5, lines 33-41) and controls the presentations by delivering presentation content to audience computers (at col. 22, lines 1-21) and allowing the creator of a broadcast to select the display method for the presentation, which allow for the control of unlike presentations (at col. 11, lines 11-31, since Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Powerpoint presentations for display to a user, and Powerpoint is well known in the art to allow random transitions between slides in a slide show, therefore making presentation displays different, and the different presentation display options of (col. 11, lines 32-39). Furthermore, Bookspan shows installing a set of files to be presented on each of a plurality of computers, including an initial file to be played and an ending file to be played (taught at col. 11, lines 11-31 as the stored HTML pages for a presentation broadcast, which inherently include the first and a last slides in a Powerpoint presentation). The Examiner also stated Bookspan also teaches associating playing timing with each set of displayed files such that an effective beginning time and play duration is associated with each file, as well as the start time

for each initial file for each instance of the presentation (taught as the ability to select a start time and an end time associated with each presentation, at Fig. 7, and col. 13, lines 20-28). Inherently, each slide in a Powerpoint presentation is displayed sequentially. (Underlining supplied by Applicant.)

The Examiner acknowledges that Bookspan, fails to explicitly teach synchronizing each computer displaying the selected presentation to a common time.

The Examiner also stated that Mills describes the use a Network Time Protocol (NTP) for synchronizing the clocks of host computers and routers in the Internet in use since 1992 (see Mills, pages 2 and 9), or over a network such as that used by Bookspan.

The Examiner stated it would be have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bookspan and Mills before at the time the invention was made to modify the synchronized broadcast system of Bookspan to include the common time synchronization of Mills in order to obtain a system for the synchronized broadcast of presentations wherein all computers in the network have a common time. (Underlining supplied by Applicant.)

The Examiner stated that one would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantages of synchronization for real-time teleconferencing and presentation broadcasting,

transaction journaling and logging, network monitoring, and secure time stamping, among other uses. See Mills, page 4. (Underlining supplied by Applicant.)

Regarding claims 2-4, the Examiner found that Microsoft Powerpoint is well known in the art to allow the inclusion of multiple selectable graphic and audio files of various formats in a presentation, which may be different from other graphic or audio files contained therein.

Regarding claim 5, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches running a second plurality of simultaneous and independent executions of the software control program for controlling a second plurality of unlike presentation displays (taught as the displaying of HTML presentations in browser windows in Fig. 3, which are well known in the art to allow for a plurality of open windows displaying different files) and coordinating a display sequence for each unlike presentation display (taught inherently by the slide sequence of a Powerpoint presentation).

Regarding claim 6, the Examiner found that Bookspan shows in Fig. 7, the setting of beginning and ending times for a presentation, which therefore sets the effective beginning time and play duration.

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner found that Bookman teaches determining an effective beginning time (at Fig. 7, as shown supra) and determines a play duration based on a collective time

of previous image files and a given play duration time (taught as the use of Windows Media Player to display the presentation, at co. 24, lines 20-28 and col. 16, lines 3-10, which is well known to display in a play list audio or video files to be played, the duration of each file, and the total duration of all files listed.)

Regarding claim 8, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches the use of a scenario file, taught as the use of .asf files for providing information pertaining to the time and sequence of audio/video data in a presentation, at col. 22, lines 8-19, which inherently uses a read scenario file command to read the scenario file. Furthermore, Bookspan must inherently teach a get image command in order to retrieve each image listed in the scenario file. Bookspan also teaches software timing control for coordinating the display timing of image files for each of a plurality of computers, taught as the ability of the presenter to synchronize the advance of the presentation or the execution of effects between all presentation displays, at cols. 23-24, lines 61-9.

The Examiner's findings regarding claims 9-10 are moot, these claims being presently canceled with the effect of canceling their subject matter.

Regarding claim 13, the Examiner found that Mills describes the use of a Network Time Protocol (NTP) for synchronizing the

clocks of host computers and routers in the Internet in use since 1992 (see Mills, pages 2 and 9), or over a network such as that used by Bookspan.

Regarding claim 14, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Outlook to schedule and synchronize presentation broadcasts across network. Outlook must be installed on every computer on the network in order for a user to receive messages about the presentation (see col. 5, lines 33-41), and controls the presentations by delivering presentation content to audience computers (at col. 22, lines 1-21) and allowing the creator of a broadcast to select the display method for the presentation, which allows for the control of unlike presentations (at col. 11, lines 11-31, since Bookspan teaches the use of Microsoft Powerpoint presentations for display to a user, and Powerpoint is well known in the art to allow random transitions between slides in a slide show therefore making presentation displays different, and the different presentation display options of col. 11, lines 32-39). The presentations are run simultaneously and synchronized with one other, and are automatically started by the presenter (see. Col. 22, lines 1-21). (Underlining supplied by Applicant.)

Regarding claim 15, the Examiner found that the use of random transitions in a Powerpoint presentation as described

above guarantees a different sequence of displays among a plurality of computers.

Regarding claim 16, the Examiner found that Bookspan shows installing a set of files to be presented on each of a plurality of computers, including an initial file to be played and an ending file to be played (taught at col. 11, lines 11-31 as the stored HTML pages for a presentation broadcast, which inherently include the first and last slides in a Powerpoint presentation). (Underlining supplied by Applicant.)

Regarding claims 17 and 18, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches associated playing timing with each set of displayed files such that an effective beginning time and play duration is associated with each file, as well as the start time for each initial file for each instance of the presentation (taught as the ability to select a start time and an end time associated with each presentation, at Fig. 7, and col. 13, lines 20-28).

Regarding claim 19, the Examiner found that Bookspan teaches running a second plurality of simultaneous and independent executions of the software control program for controlling a second plurality of unlike presentation displays (taught as the displaying of HTML presentations in browser windows in Fig. 3, which are well known in the art to allow for a plurality of open windows displaying different files), and

coordinating a display sequence for each unlike presentation display (taught inherently by the slide sequence of a Powerpoint presentation).

The Examiner's findings regarding claim 20 are moot, these claims being presently canceled with the effect of canceling the subject matter thereof.

The Examiner rejected claims 11 and 12, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Bookspan, Mills, and Hogle, IV (U.S. Patent No. 5,923,307), hereinafter Hogle.

Regarding claim 11, the Examiner found that Bookspan and Mills have been shown supra to teach a synchronized presentation display system that allows for unlike presentation displays.

However, Bookspan and Mills do not teach displaying such presentations in a multiple monitor system, or selecting a desired monitor to display a presentation.

The Examiner stated Hogle teaches configuring monitor screen displays in a multiple monitor environment, and furthermore illustrates in Fig. 4 and col. 1, lines 53-67 the display of application windows specific to a desired monitor, which may be moved to another monitor, if desired.

The Examiner stated therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Bookspan, Mills and Hogle before him at the time the invention was made to modify the synchronized presentation display system

of Bookspan and Mills to include the multiple monitor display of Hogle, in order to obtain a presentation display system shown in a multiple monitor environment.

The Examiner also stated one would be motivated to make such a combination for the advantage of reducing screen clutter or allowing the display of multiple large regions simultaneously See Hogle, col. 1, lines 42-52.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner found that Hogle teaches the combining of multiple monitors with separate raster display areas into a composite raster area, at col. 9, lines 43-45. Hogle further teaches a display command for designating a particular monitor for presentation display by setting and x,y coordinate position within the raster area, at col. 9, lines 6-9 and cols. 16-17, lines 61-8.

These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicant requests permission to make the amendments to Figure 2 as proposed in the appended Replacement Sheet. This amendment corrects the legends, and more particularly corrects the computer numbers in block diagram boxes 114, 116, 118, and 120, to bring these computer numbers into conformity with the lines 5 and 6 of page 15 of the specification.

With respect to the rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph of claims 1, 11, 14, and 19 and claim dependent therefrom, which the Examiner supplemented with the

explanation that "unlike presentation display" has multiple possible meanings, Applicant has replaced this term with --unlike graphical image display--throughout the claim program.

Claim 5 stands rejected based upon 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as inpatentable over Bookspan, et al. (ref A: U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888) and "Network Time Protocol (NTP) General Overview" (ref. U: Internet article by David L. Mills, August 2, 2004). At page 5 of the Office Action the Examiner discusses this rejection in terms of addressing the claimed method's aspect or coordinating the unlike graphical image display being played on different computer stations on the basis of a common time.

It is true that claim 5 calls for the method to install on each computer station a "control program for the control of at least one unlike graphical image display (claim 5, lines 4-7 except that in this quotation and subsequent quotations "undesired presentation display" is replaced by --undesired graphical image display--); install at least one set of files (claim 5, lines 8 and 9); associating a playing time of each set of files (claim 5, lines 13-17; and providing that each computer is synchronized to a common time. However, these are in combination with a key feature of Applicant's method, namely to have "running at least one instance of running a second plurality of simultaneous and independent executions of said control program" on a respective computer station such that the

respective computer station "controls a corresponding second plurality of unlike presentation displays and further that each instance of simultaneous and independent execution of said . . . program coordinates a display sequence for a respective one of said corresponding second plurality of unlike graphical image displays (claim 5, lines 30-42). In Applicant's invention it is the presence in his claimed combination the pre-installed control program with this key feature that enables the unlike graphical image displays on different computer stations.

In contrast, Bookspan "teaches away" from providing unlike graphical image display through the agency of a pre-installed control program. Bookspan's sole agency for this coordination is the "broadcasting" of the unlike presentation to the different stations over a broadcast network that interconnects the station. This is clear from the Examiner's discussion, reproduced earlier herein, applying the reference Bookspan to the claims in which broadcasting or a broadcasting agency is referred to in nine places underlined by Applicant. Bookspan's Abstract refers to "broadcasting" four times, and his "Summary of the Invention", col. 2, l 20 - col. 3, l. 67 refers to "broadcasting" at least thirty-three times. No disclosure, teaching or suggestion of providing unlike graphical image displays by the agency of a pre-installed program can be found in Bookspan.

It is submitted that Bookspan is irrelevant and incompetent as a basis of a '103(a) rejection of claim 5 and moreover, that Bookspan teaches away from the invention. Applicant respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw his rejection of claim 5, and instead allow it.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 have been amended to depend from claim 5, and therefore contain limitations rendering Bookspan irrelevant, so that their allowance is also requested.

Applicant has amended claim 13 which addresses a software program article of manufacture aspect of the invention. Prior to amendment, claim 13 recited a combination including the internal clock of all computers being set to a common time (claim 13, lines 29 and 30); and a coordination of graphical image files by software timing control (claim 13, lines 22-24). Applicant's present amendments import into claim 13 local storage of unlike graphical images (claim 13, lines 9-11) the applicant's feature of simultaneous and independent control program execution enable unlike graphical image at different station through the agency of pre-installed control programs at each computer station (claim 13, lines 32-42). (Rather than Bookspan's teaching of broadcasting over a network). Per the same argument as presented with respect to claim 5, it is submitted that amended claim 13, and claims 11 and 12 which have been amended to depend from claim 13, are also allowable.

Applicant has amended claim 19 which addresses another computer related method aspect of the invention. Prior to amendment claim 19 recited a method combination of providing installation of a control program in each of the computer for the control by each compute of at least one unlike graphical image display (claim 19, lines 6-14; and Applicant's feature of employment of simultaneous and independent control program execution to enable displaying unlike graphical image display on the computers (claim 19, lines 24-35). Applicant has amended the claim to recite that the method being claimed is for plural computers synchronized to a common time (claim 19 lines 2 and 3). As a result claim 19 now distinguishes over Bookspan as has been argued with respect to claim 5. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 19, and claims 15 and 18 amended to depend from claim 19, are allowable.

Applicant respectfully suggests in view of these remarks that all grounds for rejection and objection have been removed by the foregoing amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are therefore earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone Michael F. Oglo, Attorney for Applicant, at 401-832-4736 if, in the opinion of the Examiner, such a telephone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of the subject patent application.

Application Serial No: 09/977,900
In reply to Office Action of 30 September 2004

Attorney Docket No. 80072

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE W. STEVENS

30 December 2004

By Michael F Oglo
MICHAEL F. OGLO
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 20464

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Containing amended Figure 2